1631

Docket Number 38-21(51376)B

PATENT

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.10

Michelle Ludwig

In re Application of: Corbin et al. Serial No.: 09/663,779

Filed: September 15, 2000

Title: Bacillus Thuringiensis Chromosomal

Genome Sequences and Uses Thereof

Group Art Unit: 1631

Examiner: Carolyn L. Smith

Conf. No. 2711

MAIL STOP NON-FEE AMENDMENT Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Transmitted herewith are the following documents in the above-identified application.

- X Response to Office Communication
- X If an extension or an additional extension of time is required, but is not enclosed, please consider this a conditional petition therefor and charge Deposit Account 13-4125 accordingly.
- X No fee is believed required with this filing.
- X Please charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 13-4125. A duplicate copy of this sheet is attached.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy K. Ball, Ph.D., Esq.

Reg. No. 42,287

Monsanto Company

800 North Lindbergh, Mail Zone E2NA

St. Louis, Missouri 63167 (314) 694-5811 (phone)

(314) 694-5311 (fax)



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.10

I hereby certify that the documents enclosed herein are being deposited with the United States Postal Service on this 15th day of 2000 per 2003 in an envelope as "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Mailing Label Number EV113668462US addressed to: MAIL STOP NON-FEE AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Michelle Ludwig

In re application of:

Corbin et al.

Examiner: Carolyn L. Smith

Serial No.: 09/663,779

Group Art Unit: 1631

Filed: September 15, 2000

Conf. No. 2711

For: Bacillus Thuringiensis Chromosomal
Genome Sequences and Uses Thereof

October 15, 2000

Conf. No. 2711

MAIL STOP NON-FEE AMENDMENT Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO OFFICE COMMUNICATION

This paper is filed in response to the above captioned Office Communication mailed November 28, 2003. The Examiner has again indicated that the previous response amending the specification to remove embedded hyperlinks was insufficient to accomplish the requirement. The Examiner indicated that the response was believed to be in good faith however, but even with the receipt of the above captioned Office Communication, the Applicant was unable to determine which, if any, of the hyperlinks